UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,548	04/26/2001	Koichi Nakamura	JP919990227US1 (590.049)	9240

35195 7590 12/28/2005	EXAMINER	
FERENCE & ASSOCIATES	PHILLIPS, HASSAN A	
409 BROAD STREET		
PITTSBURGH, PA 15143	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2151	

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _05 October 2005_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-8,10-15,17 and 18_ is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-8,10-15,17 and 18_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

  1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

  2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

  3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications filed on October 5, 2005.

Claim Objections

2. After consideration of the amendments made to claim 18, to correct minor informalities, Examiner has withdrawn the objection to claim 18.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed October 5, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that:

    a) The owner identifier of the present invention is not taught or suggested by Nakayama's use of an attribute indicator; and,

    b) The invention's use of a management table and object management table is not disclosed by the teachings of Nakayama.

Examiner respectfully submits that Applicant has misinterpreted the prior art of record.

4. Regarding item a), Applicant has amended the claims to teach the "owner identifier" indicating the "creator of objects". In Applicant's arguments, Applicant acknowledges Nakayama teaches "authors" and "owners", where authors are the "creator of objects" and owners are allowed to control the objects (Nakayama, col. 5, lines 50-58). Examiner submits Nakayama teaches Applicant's claimed "owner

identifier", since Nakayama teaches an author identifier (154), (Nakayama, col. 7, lines 52-64). Applicant further states in the arguments however, "what is not taught or disclosed in Nakayama is the displaying of an author identifier that is a representation of a user who actually generated the object". Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertions. In the arguments, Applicant recognizes Nakayama teaches displaying an owner identifier (Nakayama, col. 7, lines 27-42). Applicant also acknowledges this owner identifier can be the author identifier, however, mentions that such a case would only occur by coincidence. Contrary to Applicant's assertions, Examiner submits not only does Nakayama teach the object identifier being set as the author identifier by default, (Nakayama, col. 9, lines 31-33, also see Fig. 8), Nakayama clearly indicates if an object attribute is set to "open private" a displayed owner identifier would be the author identifier since the owner of the object is the author and is the only participant who has the right to operate the object, (Nakayama, col. 5, line 64 through col. 6, line 2).

5. Regarding item b), Applicant has amended the claims to teach the user management table comprising node identification codes, user names, owner identifiers, and security levels. Examiner maintains Nakayama teaches a user management table (142) comprising node identification codes (147), since this code is used to identify the window on which an object is to be displayed, (Nakayama col. 7, lines 52-64). Examiner submits Nakayama further teaches the user management table comprising owner identifiers (154) since, as previously mentioned, this attribute indicates the

creator of objects, (Nakayama, col. 7, lines 52-64). Examiner further submits

Nakayama teaches the user management table comprising security levels (168), since

this attribute allows for an object to be shared or privately owned, (col. 7, line 65 through

col. 8, line 20).

Applicant has also amended the claims to teach the object management table

comprising node identification codes, object data, and graying-out flags. Examiner

maintains Nakayama teaches an object management table (142) comprising node

identification codes (147), since this code is used to identify the window on which an

object is to be displayed, (Nakayama col. 7, lines 52-64). Examiner submits Nakayama

further teaches the object management table comprising object data (178) since this

attribute indicates a form the object is to take, (Nakayama, col. 8, lines 26-31).

Examiner agrees the teachings of Nakayama fail to expressly disclose the user

management table comprising user names, or the object management table comprising

graying-out flags. Nevertheless, Applicant's arguments with respect to these limitations

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1-5, 8, 13, 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Nakayama et al., (hereinafter Nakayama), U.S. Patent 5,872,924, in

view of Noveck et al. (hereinafter Noveck), U.S. patent 6,823,363.

8.   In considering claim 1, Nakayama teaches a computer system comprising: a

plurality of user systems connected to each other, each user system being adapted to

display a work area on a display screen, alternatively a plurality of user systems

connected to each other through a computer network (Fig. 1), wherein each of the user

systems includes: a collaboration work controller having a user management table

(142) for registering a node identification code (147) given for each of the user systems

and an owner identifier (154), which indicates the creator of objects, related to the node

identification code, wherein said user management table comprises node identifications

codes, owner identifiers, and security levels (168), and an object management table

(142) for registering object information related to the node identification code, wherein

said object management table comprises node identification codes and object data

(178), (col. 7, line 46 through col. 8, line 31, Fig.'s 7 and 8); and, an obtainer for

obtaining, based on an event entry for an object, the node identification code related to

the object by referring to the object management table, obtaining the owner identifier

related to the obtained node identification code by referring to the user management

table, and displaying an owner identifier on the screen in a manner that the obtained

owner identifier can be discriminated from owner identifiers of other objects, (col. 7,

lines 27-42).

Although the disclosed system of Nakayama shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly show: the user management table comprising user names.

Nevertheless, Nakayama does teach the user management table comprising user identifications (160), (col. 7, lines 52-64, Fig.'s 7 and 8).

Thus, it would have been apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Nakayama to show the user management table comprising user names instead of user identifications. This would have advantageously made it easier to determine who owns a particular object, (Nakayama, col. 7, lines 52-64, Fig.'s 7 and 8).

Although the modified system of Nakayama shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it further fails to expressly disclose: the object management table comprising graying-out flags.

Nevertheless, graying-out flags were well known in the art at the time of the present invention. In a similar field of endeavor, graying-out flags are used in the teachings of Noveck to: prevent editing a message by graying out an "edit" button, (col. 7, lines 16-21).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to show Nakayama teaching the object management table comprising graying-out flags. This would have facilitated restricting operation of an object displayed on a shared window in a more versatile manner (Nakayama, col. 1, lines 60-63, Noveck, col. 5, lines 40-55).

9. In considering claim 2, Nakayama further teaches the event entry being a drawing operation carried out by the owner of the object, alternatively a selection operation carried out by a user other than the owner of the object, (col. 10, line 54, through col. 11, line 45).

10. In considering claim 3, Nakayama teaches the owner identifier being displayed at one of starting and finishing points of the object, and at other points of the object by means of superposition, (col. 7, lines 36-42, Fig. 6).

11. In considering claim 4, Nakayama teaches an editor for performing an editing operation including copying, movement, deletion and others for the obtained object, (col. 5, line 50, through col. 6, line 16).

12. In considering claim 5, Nakayama teaches registering security level information (148) related to the node identification code, and the editing operation being permitted within a range compliant with the security level information, (col. 7, line 65, through col. 8, line 20).

13. In considering claims 8 and 15, Nakayama teaches a method and computer readable storage medium recording program codes used for identifying the owner of a collaboration work object, the object having been created based on collaboration work by using a computer system having a plurality of user systems connected to each other,

alternatively a plurality of user systems connected to each other through a computer network, comprising the steps of: causing one of the user systems to store object data contained in collaboration work data received from the other user systems in an object management table (142) by relating the data to a node identification code (147) of each of the other user systems, and to display an object thereof on a screen of the user system, wherein said object management table comprises node identification codes and object data (178), (col. 7, line 46 through col. 8, line 31, Fig.'s 7 and 8); obtaining the node identification code by referring to the object management table when the object displayed on the screen is selected, (col. 7, lines 46-64); obtaining an owner identifier (154), which indicates the creator of objects, related to the obtained node identification code by referring to the user management table of the user system, wherein said user management table comprises node identifications codes, owner identifiers, and security levels (168), (col. 7, line 46 through col. 8, line 31, Fig.'s 7 and 8); and displaying the owner identifier on the screen, by means of superposition at one of starting and finishing points of the selected object, and other points of the selected object, (col. 7, lines 36-42, Fig. 6).

Although the disclosed system of Nakayama shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly show: the user management table comprising user names.

Nevertheless, Nakayama does teach the user management table comprising user identifications (160), (col. 7, lines 52-64, Fig.'s 7 and 8).

Thus, it would have been apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Nakayama to show the user management table comprising user names instead of user identifications. This would have advantageously made it easier to determine who owns a particular object, (Nakayama, col. 7, lines 52-64, Fig.'s 7 and 8).

Although the modified system of Nakayama shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it further fails to expressly disclose: the object management table comprising graying-out flags.

Nevertheless, graying-out flags were well known in the art at the time of the present invention. In a similar field of endeavor, graying-out flags are used in the teachings of Noveck to: prevent editing a message by graying out an "edit" button, (col. 7, lines 16-21).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to show Nakayama teaching the object management table comprising graying-out flags. This would have facilitated restricting operation of an object displayed on a shared window in a more versatile manner (Nakayama, col. 1, lines 60-63, Noveck, col. 5, lines 40-55).

14. In considering claim 13, Nakayama further teaches transmitting, when any one of the plurality of user systems starts collaboration work, user information containing a node identification code thereof and an owner identifier to the other user systems, (col. 9, line 54, through col. 11, line 18); and causing the other user systems having received the user information to store in each user management table, (col. 7, lines 46-64).

15. Claims 6, 14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Nakayama in view of Noveck, and further in view of Itakura, U.S. patent 6,639,608.

16. In considering claims 6 and 14, although the disclosed system of Nakayama

shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly show: deleting

or eliminating the display of the owner identifier according to a timer operation.

Nevertheless, Itakura teaches a system for displaying images received from a

network comprising: deleting an image received over the network according to a timer

operation, (col. 10, lines 53-67, col. 11, lines 1-5).

Thus given the teachings of Itakura, it would have been apparent to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Nakayama to show deleting or

eliminating the display of the owner identifier on the screen of the user system

according to a timer operation. This would have made a user effectively aware of who

owns the object for a specified period of time, (Nakayama, col. 1, lines 37-63, Itakura,

col. 2, lines 54-67, and col. 3, lines 1-15).

17. Claims 7, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Nakayama in view of Noveck, and further in view of Simonoff, U.S.

patent 6,463,460.

18. In considering claim 7, Nakayama further teaches a session controller for controlling a session for each collaboration work (col. 4, lines 14-27), wherein the session controller includes a management table (142) for registering a user identification code (146) for identifying a user taking part in the session, and a node identification code (147) of the user system used by the user, and the session controller refers to the management table, and transmits data to the other user systems taking part in the session regarding all sessions registering the user identification code contained in data sent from the user, (col. 7, lines 46-64, col. 4, lines 14-27).

Although the disclosed system of Nakayama shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly show: code for identifying the session.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor, Simonoff teaches an interactive communication system for collaboration between users comprising: inherent use of a code for identifying a collaboration session, (col. 24, line 53, through col. 25 line 2).

Thus given the teachings of Simonoff, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Nakayama to show registering a session identification code for identifying a session in the management table. This would have provided an efficient means for allowing users to join a session already in progress, (Simonoff col. 24, line 53, through col. 25 line 2). This also would have advantageously provided a means for storing session for later playback and/or critiquing, (Simonoff, col. 25, lines 25-37).

19. In considering claim 10, Nakayama teaches the owner identifier . which indicates the creator of objects, being displayed at one of starting and finishing points of the object, and at other points of the object by means of superposition, (col. 5, line 64 through col. 6, line 2, col. 7, lines 36-42, col. 9, lines 31-33, Fig.'s 6 and 8).

20. In considering claim 11, Nakayama teaches performing an editing operation including copying, movement, deletion and others for the obtained object, (col. 5, line 50, through col. 6, line 16).

21. In considering claim 12, Nakayama teaches registering security level information (148) related to the node identification code, and the editing operation being permitted within a range compliant with the security level information, (col. 7, line 65, through col. 8, line 20).

22. In considering claims 17 and 18, Nakayama teaches a method and computer readable storage medium recording program codes used for identifying a collaboration work object, the object having been created based on collaboration work by using a computer system having a plurality of user systems connected to each other, alternatively a plurality of user systems connected to each other through a computer network, comprising the steps of: causing one of the user systems to store object data contained in collaboration work data received from the other user systems in an object management table (142) by relating the data to a node identification code (147) of each

of the other user systems, wherein said object management table comprises node identification codes and object data (178), (col. 7, line 46 through col. 8, line 31, Fig.'s 7 and 8); displaying on the screen of said user system the collaboration work objects created during a collaboration work session, (col. 11, line 56, through col. 12, line 63); displaying on the screen of said user system the owners of collaboration work objects created during said collaboration work session, wherein an owner is the creator of objects, (col. 7, line 46 through col. 8, line 31, Fig.'s 7 and 8); and obtaining the node identification code given for a user system by referring to a user management table (142) of the user system and the work objects related to the obtained node identification code by referring to the object management table, wherein said user management table comprises node identifications codes, owner identifiers, and security levels (168), (col. 7, line 46 through col. 8, line 31, Fig.'s 7 and 8).

Although the disclosed system of Nakayama shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly show: the user management table comprising user names.

Nevertheless, Nakayama does teach the user management table comprising user identifications (160), (col. 7, lines 52-64, Fig.'s 7 and 8).

Thus, it would have been apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Nakayama to show the user management table comprising user names instead of user identifications. This would have advantageously made it easier to determine who owns a particular object, (Nakayama, col. 7, lines 52-64, Fig.'s 7 and 8).

Although the modified system of Nakayama shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it further fails to expressly disclose: the object management table comprising graying-out flags.

Nevertheless, graying-out flags were well known in the art at the time of the present invention. In a similar field of endeavor, graying-out flags are used in the teachings of Noveck to: prevent editing a message by graying out an "edit" button, (col. 7, lines 16-21).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to show Nakayama teaching the object management table comprising graying-out flags. This would have facilitated restricting operation of an object displayed on a shared window in a more versatile manner (Nakayama, col. 1, lines 60-63, Noveck, col. 5, lines 40-55).

Although the disclosed modified system of Nakayama shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it still further fails to expressly show: displaying a particular owner's objects by selecting the owner.

Nevertheless, displaying objects by means of selection was well known in the art at the time of the present invention. This is exemplified in the teachings of Simonoff. Simonoff teaches selecting a resource list in order to display a variety of objects created for use in collaboration work sessions, (col. 15, line 55, through col. 16, line 2).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Nakayama to show displaying a particular owner's objects by selecting the owner. This would have provided an efficient means for selecting objects, owned by

other users, to be displayed during a collaboration session, Simonoff, col. 15, lines 55-61.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571) 272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HP/
12/16/05

Khanh Pnh
Primary Examiner.